



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/578,933   | 05/08/2006  | Stephen Townsend     | GB03 0201 US1       | 4533             |
| 8791   | 7590        | 10/13/2010           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP<br>1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY<br>SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040 |             |                      | NGUYEN, NGA X       |                  |
|  |             | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER        |                  |
|  |             | 3662                 |                     |                  |
|  |             | MAIL DATE            | DELIVERY MODE       |                  |
|  |             | 10/13/2010           | PAPER               |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|   |                        |                     |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Advisory Action<br/>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |
|   | 10/578,933             | TOWNSEND ET AL.     |
|   | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |
|   | NGA X. NGUYEN          | 3662                |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 02 June 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
  - (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Note Below.
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Thomas H. Tarcza/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3662

With respect to claim 1 & 9, applicant argues that:

- Lennen does not teach " A processor for outputing the GPS signal samples together with ancillary and/or the GPS signals which relate to the GPS receiver and contain IF signal which remains modulated.

- Brown does not teach processing the GPS signal samples using the ancillary information to determine a position fix.

- Lennen's ancillary information and Brown's ancillary information are different, so the both system can not be usable for the same purpose.  
Examiner Responses:

- Lennen teaches detail how to remove the intermediate frequency by using the complex mixer translates the intermediate frequencies signals to baseband which is part of Lennen's invention. However, he also teaches an alternatively embodiment that the processor could provide raw codes, carrier phase measurements to another processor system to compute position fix (see page 3, paragraph 39). It is obvious that if Lennen's processor 12, providing raw samples, the device does not needed to use the complex mixer to remove the intermediate frequencies signal, so that the raw samples still contain the intermediate frequencies.

- Brown teaches a a GPS receiver including an A/D converter (see column 6, lines 5-6) and providing the time sample of the raw GPS data is stored in the data buffer 20 which is transmitted to the GPS data processor 50, so that the workstation 70 could compute position and velocity (see column 5, lines 15-61).

- Lennen's ancillary information is carrier phase measurement and Brown's ancillary information is time sample. Yes, they are different. However, it is part of the ancillary information which is met the applications' claim invention. Lennen does not teaches A/D converter but Brown teaches A/D converter (see column 5-6, lines 8-30). It would have been obvious to modify Lennen by incorporating the teaching of Brown's device to have A/D converter and output raw GPS samples so that the system could provide GPS samples with ancillary information to perform position more consistency.